

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/512,267	02/24/2000	Woon-Yong Park	06192.0100	5968	
75	90 11/18/2003	•	EXAM	EXAMINER	
McGuire Woods LLP			KUMAR, SRI	KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K	
1750 Tysons Bo	oulevard			D. DED MILITER	
Suite 1800		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
McLean, VA 22102			2675	15	
			DATE MAIL ED: 11/19/2000	, ,	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

, ÷			AR
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	0
Advisory Action	09/512,267	PARK ET AL.	
, and a second	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Srilakshmi K. Kumar	2675	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea	void abandonment of this application at the same of th	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing da b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the mai	g date of the final rejecting HE FINAL REJECTION.  R 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'     37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	s Brief must be filed within the pe		
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by		. и.о арроан	
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require furth		see NOTE below):	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	· ·	,,	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or		rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: _		idered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	· · ·		and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 24-43.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	oroved or b)☐ disapproved by t	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( P70,1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:	theller		
	STEVEN SARAS PERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER		
30	TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600		



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment will not be entered as they raise new issues. Further, the voltage differences are obvious as LCDs with gray scale have voltage differences. These voltage differences are between a common electrode and a pixel electrode, and would be another way of disclosing known pulse amplitude modulation with a split screen display.